

## REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

### Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended grammatically. Claims 2-16 are cancelled. New claims 17-32 are added. New claim 17 is directed to the use of chlorinated polyethylene (e.g., p. 11, third paragraph, and original claim 4), and new claim 21 includes a pressing step (e.g., original claim 5). Those claims that recite pressing also recite that stress strain is not re-introduced to the magnetic powder particles by the pressing, as discussed below. No new matter is presented.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 1 stands rejected hereunder as anticipated by Yoshida (US 5,827,445), which rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection states, without support, that Yoshida teaches preparing a magnetic powder "and then subjecting the soft magnetic powder to annealing so that it is free from stress strain." Instead, Yoshida teaches that controlling the "residual strain" by annealing, in combination with the sign of the magnetostriction constant and the shape magnetic anisotropy, allows some control over the magnetic resonance frequencies. (Col. 4, ln. 37-58.) Note Fig. 2 and the accompanying disclosure at column eight (lines 32-44) of Yoshida. There is no disclosure in Yoshida that the powder is "free from stress strain."

In contrast, the point of the present invention is that the powder is annealed to be free from stress strain and that further processing does not re-introduce the stress strain to the powder eliminated by annealing. As shown in Fig. 1 (see,

e.g., specification at p. 12, first through third paragraphs), processing according to the present invention does not re-introduce stress strain eliminated by annealing, in comparison with a sheet pressed using metal rolls. Because Yoshida does not disclose that the annealed powder is free from stress strain this claim is not anticipated; and because Yoshida does not describe that further processing does not induce stress strain the newly added independent claims are not anticipated. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding the coupling agent recited in original claims 2 and 13, now cancelled and recited in claims 18 and 22, the portion of Yoshida cited in the rejection does not disclose any coupling agent. As explained at the paragraph bridging pages seven and eight of this application, a typical coupling agent includes a metal atom and a functional group (usually polar). No coupling agent is seen to be disclosed by Yoshida, and the Examiner acknowledges such in the rejection under § 103. Rather, the treatment of the surface of the particles in the portion of Yoshida cited in the rejection relates to an oxidation reaction at the surface of the particles to provide a dielectric layer (e.g., col. 3, ln. 14-19).

Regarding the rejection of original claim 4 as now embodied in new claim 17, the recited chlorinated polyethylene (CPE) is not the same as poly(vinyl chloride) (PVC). The former is made by chlorinating polyethylene, and thus has moieties such as  $-(\text{CH}_2\text{-CH}_2)_w\text{-(CH}_2\text{-CHCl)}_x\text{-}_y$ , wherein one of the hydrogens of the ethylene moiety is replaced by chlorine. The latter is made by polymerizing vinyl chloride monomer,  $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHCl}$ , and thus yields repeating moieties  $-\text{CH}_2\text{-CHCl-}_y$ . These two polymers are distinguishable in the art, and CPE is not disclosed by Yoshida.

With regard to the rejection of original claims 6-8 reciting pressing, now recited in other new claims, as noted above with reference to Applicants' Fig. 1 and the accompanying disclosure, the claimed pressing does not defeat the annealing process that reduced the stress strain in the particles, and it does so

without shifting the magnetic resonance frequency or decreasing the relative permeabilities  $\mu'$  and  $\mu''$ . Yoshida makes no such disclosure but rather uses a combination of variables to control the magnetic resonance frequency. The Yoshida disclosure at col. 4, ln. 3-9, cited in the rejection, relates to rolling as a process for producing the magnetic particles, not for producing the composite body (where the particles are in a binder) as recited in the rejected claims.

With regard to the rejection of original claims 9-10 and 16, now recited in other new claims, the portions of Yoshida at column four cited in the rejection provide no disclosure regarding layering and pressing multiple sheets; rather, those cited portions describe the production of flat particles and the production of an oxide (dielectric) coating thereon. All of the examples in Yoshida appear to use a doctor blade and then hot-pressing of a single film; there appears to be no disclosure in Yoshida of layering and pressing a plurality of films.

Therefore, these rejections should be withdrawn.

#### Rejection under 35 USC 103

Original claims 3 and 14, now embodied in new claims 18 and 22, which recite the use of coupling agents, stand rejected hereunder as obvious over the combination of Yoshida and Ochiai, which rejection is respectfully traversed.

Contrary to the rejection under § 102, this rejection acknowledges that Yoshida fails to disclose the use of coupling agents, but alleges that it would have been obvious to use the silane coupling agents described by Ochiai to improve the lipophilic properties of the powder, which motivation is not understood and clarification is requested. (In fact, Ochiai discloses that the powder is preferably subjected to a "defatting treatment" at the sentence bridging columns three and four.)

Ochiai is directed to magnetic cores, whereas the present invention (and Yoshida) are directed to electromagnetic interference suppressors; note Ochiai at

col. 7 (ln. 48-54), wherein losses are low, which is a characteristic opposite to that desired for an EMI suppressor. Ochiai provides no disclosure of annealing to eliminate stress strain, and describes a process that includes the step of compression molding (e.g., col. 5, ln. 3-13) without any appreciation that such can introduce stress strain.

Thus, even to the extent that coupling agents are known in the art, Ochiai provides no teaching or disclosure that closes the deficiencies in Yoshida, and is not properly combined with Yoshida because each is directed to a different type of product (magnetic core versus interference suppressor) of a different geometry (sheet in Yoshida versus molded article in Ochiai). Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to combine these references, and even if the combination were proper, the present invention would not have been obvious from the combination, so this rejection should also be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

In light of the foregoing remarks and amendments, withdrawal of the rejections, and further and favorable action, in the form of a notice of allowance, are believed to be next in order, and such actions are earnestly solicited.